[25th February 1929

Mr. R. Nagan Gowda :—"It is stated in the Chief Engineer's letter that 50 per cent of the estimated cost is to be borne by the ryots. May I know on what ground contribution from the ryot is asked for ?"

The hon. Sir Norman Marjoribanks :—"I must ask for notice."

Agreement between the Mysore and Madras Governments regarding the regulation of the Cauvery water.

*1452 Q.—Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether there has been any intimation from the Government of Mysore that they are not satisfied with the present agreement between that Government and the Government of Madras regarding the regulation of the Cauveri water;

(b) whether the Government have taken any steps in the matter and, if so, to what effect;

(c) whether it is a fact that it is contemplated to refer the disputes to a Board of Arbitration and to include some non-official gentlemen also as members of the Arbitration Board; and

(d) whether the Government will be pleased to give a detailed statement as to how matters stand at present regarding the question ?

A.—(a) & (b) The answer to clause (a) is in the negative.

(c) & (d) The attention of the hon. Member is invited to Rules 7 and 8 of the Rules of Regulation of the Krishnarajasagara Reservoir annexed to the 1924 agreement which was placed on the Editors' table with G.O. No. 228 I., dated 3rd July 1924. Difference has arisen between the two Governments as regards Rule 8. Under that rule, the discharges corresponding to the gauge readings mentioned in Rule 7 have to be worked out on the basis of the joint gaugings of the ten years ending with 1926 and adopted for all subsequent regulation. The Mysore Darbar contend that on account of the floods of 1924 the regime of the river altered and that they cannot accept the results of the gaugings made after the floods, which gave larger discharges than in the previous years. They suggest that the gaugings for the seven and a half years preceding the floods might be taken as the basis of all future regulation. The Madras Government do not agree and insist on a strict observance of the rule as the idea of an average presupposes circumstances such as those above referred to. As no agreement could be reached, the matter is to be decided by an Arbitration Committee consisting of a High Court Judge to be nominated by both the Governments and two other arbitrators, one to be nominated by each of the Governments, the decision of the majority prevailing. There are other points of difference of a technical nature in the working of the Rules of Regulation of the Krishnarajasagara Reservoir which have not yet emerged from the stage of negotiation and in the event of a dead-lock in any or all of those questions they also may eventually have to be referred to arbitration.

25th February 1929]

Mr. S. Satyamurti :—" May I know, with regard to the last two sentences of the answer to clauses (*c*) and (*d*), when the Government expect the arbitration to begin on the matter ? "

The hon. Sir Norman Marjoribanks :—" In April."

Mr. S. Satyamurti :—" This year ? "

The hon Sir Norman Marjoribanks :—" Yes."

Land Revenue

Alleged assault on one Kandan of Latteri by the Tahsildar of Gudiyattam.

*1453-A Q.—Mr. T. Adinarayana Chettiyar : Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to enquire and state—

(*a*) whether soon after Mr. Gnanaprakasam was posted to act as Tahsildar of Gudiyattam he assaulted one Kandan of Latteri ;

(*b*) whether Toti Kandan filed a criminal complaint against the Tahsildar before the Sub-Magistrate, Gudiyattam ;

(*c*) how the case was disposed of ; and

(*d*) what notice was taken of the conduct of Mr. Gnanaprakasam in that connexion ?

A.—(*a*) to (*d*) A report will be called for.

Mr. R. Nagan Gowda :—" May I ask whether information has been received since this answer was given ? "

The hon. Sir Norman Marjoribanks :—" Not so far as I am aware of, Sir."

Alleged assault of Toti Muthan by the Tahsildar of Gudiyattam

* 1453-B Q.—Mr. T. Adinarayana Chettiyar : Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to call for a report regarding the assault made by Mr. Gnanaprakasam, Tahsildar, on Toti Muthan of Latteri in the North Arcot district in 1925 or 1926 and place the same on the Council table ?

A.—If the allegation in this question is the same as that in question No. 1453-A, the hon. Member is referred to the answer to that question. If this is a different case, a report will be called for and the question of placing papers on the table considered after such report shall have been received.

Alleged assault of a ryot at Katpadi by the Tahsildar of Gudiyattam.

* 1453-C Q.—Mr. T. Adinarayana Chettiyar : Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the Government have obtained the necessary particulars regarding the assault on a ryot at Katpadi by Mr. Gnanaprakasam till recently Tahsildar of Gudiyattam ;

(*b*) whether the Collector of North Arcot made any independent enquiry regarding the assault at Katpadi ;